GO NO: 1952-53 & 2111
Judicial (Con)
dt. 9.8.1879.

(Spare copy) S/c

11 Sheet

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக்
கொள்ளப்பட்ட ஆகஸ்டு
மாதம் 1991 வருடம்
செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த ஆகஸ்டு
மாதம் 1991 வருடம்
ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளர்
கையொப்பம்

Original
1952-1953 & 2111
d/9.8.1879

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

9th August 1879, Nos. 1952, 1953 & 2111.

Rampa Country.

Read the following paper:—

From H. E. SULLIVAN, Esq., on Special Duty, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated Rajahmundry, 25th July 1879, *No. I.*

Unfortunately on my arrival here I was laid up with an inflamed eye, and as the doctor prohibited my using it, my work has been somewhat retarded. I have not, however, been absolutely idle, and have collected some useful information from the records of the Sub-Collector's office which will materially assist me in determining the line of action to be pursued. I am having this extracted, and will submit copies with my next.* I hope the Government will be satisfied with demi-official communications, as I am particularly anxious to keep my friend the Mansabdar in the dark as to my intentions. I have evidence to show that, for a long time, he has liberally feed the Government officials in this neighbourhood, and if I give my letters into the office to be copied the odds are that my clerks would be got at. I had heard this, and that the police were in his pay from one or two natives with whom I had talked on the subject, and yesterday in the Sub-Collector's records I came upon an extract† from his accounts for 1868-69, in which the officials bribed from Tahsildars down to peons and constables are mentioned by name, and the amount of the *douceur* paid to each specified. I have already seen quite enough to convince me that for many years the Mansabdar has been levying unauthorised cesses from the Mootahdars, and one by one acquiring the Mootahs as personal property, and this with the show of being backed by Government authority. I yesterday telegraphed to you to ascertain the views of Government *in re* the Board's Proceedings of the 19th August 1872, No. 1,627, and to-day I have before me a case‡, now pending before the Sub-Collector, in which the Mansabdar lays claim to the Mootah of Vélamoor on the ground that the deceased Mootahdarni left no legal§ heirs, and "that therefore the mootah should come under his management in accordance with the custom and practice of his estate, and *with reference to the rules prescribed by the Board of Revenue*," copy of whose Proceedings is attached to the petition. I own a perusal of these Proceedings took me fairly aback, and I was intensely relieved on getting hold of the printed copy to find that they had never been submitted to Government: by whom the principles laid down by the Board of that epoch will, I presume, be disavowed. It is probable that the other mootahs which are now in the personal enjoyment of the Mansabdar were similarly acquired. Without going into detail at present, I may mention that from a memorandum which I asked Foster to have ready for me, I gather that the Man-

* Sent herewith.

† *Vide* Mr. Gribble's letter, No. 117(*b*), dated 20th June 1871.

‡ *Vide* Memorandum marked A.

§ *N.B.*—There are two sons and two daughters by nicka wives.

sabdar's Vakeel admits that his master derives Rs. 3,000 from the mootahs which have come under his personal management, and that in making a settlement of the villages which compose each mootah, he believes himself to be in no way bound by the engagement of 1847-48,—a belief in which he is fully supported by the Board's Proceedings of 1872. This amount appears in the Mansabdar's revenue accounts, but does not include numerous fees and *douceurs* paid by the hillmen to his agents and to our police who are held *in terrorem* over them. A fair instance of the manner in which the screw has been applied, and the ingenuity with which it has been made to appear to the hill-people that the exactions were made under the authority of the Sircar will be found in a report* of Gribble's who was Acting Sub-Collector in 1871, which is now being copied. Any thing more lamentably weak than the action† taken by the Collector (Frazer) thereon can hardly be conceived. Had the Mansabdar been brought up with a round turn then and there, it is probable that the present disturbance would never have occurred. This was eight years ago, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the same game has been going on ever since,—in itself quite enough to make these semi-civilised people turn on the Sircar under whose sanction their oppressor was supposed to be acting. Then came the last straw of all,—the imposition of the "Chiguru pannu" by the Sircar toddy-renter, and simultaneously of the "Modalu pannu" by the Mansabdar. I yesterday employed the Sub-Collector's Sheristadar, a very intelligent man of high character who is now on leave, to visit some of the hillmen in jail here, in view to his ascertaining whether any information could be obtained from them in regard to the immediate cause of the rising. He has travelled in the Rampa country, and I thought it more likely that they would open their hearts to him than if I went down to take a formal deposition. I enclose the notes‡ he took of the conversation he had with them. The grievances especially put forward are the imposition of the toddy-rents and the exactions of the police. In regard to the latter it may, I think, be accepted as a fact, and I see but little use in trying to establish any specific instances. They have been the willing instruments of the Mansabdar, merchants, and money-lenders and abkari renters, and in assisting them in enforcing their claims against the hill-people, they have not omitted to line their own pockets. It was their nature to if not looked after. The arrack-renter of the taluk visited me yesterday in reference to his alleged losses in the Rampa country, one cause of which he openly stated was his not having been able to obtain the assistance of the police since the rising, and he added with a sigh "It was different in former years."

* *Vide* Mr. Gribble's letter, dated 12th June 1871, No. 116.

† *Vide* his letter, dated 23rd June 1871, No. 102.

‡ *Vide* paper marked B.

Until the country has quieted down a little, I fear I shall not be able to do much with the mootahdars. Those who are not out on 'fituri' are engaged in defending their villages from the raids of the insurgents, or are in hiding, so I am going to camp at Koregonda in the neighbourhood of Yerrumpaliem where the Mansabdar lives, and will invite him over to a friendly conference; my object being to ascertain from himself, his people, and his records how he came to acquire the mootahs now under his personal management, and what his income is from the hill estate and from his villages in the plain. This will be useful when hereafter it comes to be determined how he is to be dealt with, and he is so fully under the impression that he is under the ægis of the Sircar that I don't anticipate much difficulty in getting out of him what I require. This feeling of security I intend to foster until I am ready to spring the mine. At this point I shall feel the want of powers to act on my own responsibility as circumstances may dictate. There is a general consensus of opinion, European and Native, that the work of pacification would be much facilitated by the removal of the Mansabdar. The hill-people believe that his oppressive acts have had the sanction of the Sircar, and the only way to disabuse them of this idea is to send him out of the district, and not till then will the mootahdars really believe that Government intend to redress their grievances. To me the papers which form enclosures to this carry proof that the

Mansabdar has for many years violated the conditions of his agreement, and thereby rendered himself liable to the penalties attaching thereto, and if further proof be wanting I have little doubt it will be forthcoming when I interview him. In this case I would propose to take his six villages in the plains under Government management (as a temporary measure), and to send him to Nellore with orders to remain there until he got permission to return. Whether he should ever be allowed to do so, or whether he should be reduced to the position of a stipendiary would form matter for after consideration; but until the country has quieted down his absence is most desirable, and this measure, in my opinion, is the only one which will give the hill-people confidence in the good intentions of Government towards them. If these views are accepted, I ask for discretionary power to carry them out. His deportation will, of course, be an act of State, and I should like to have the order in my pocket to use when necessary. We heard to-day from Lord Guillamore from Konda-Modalu (Linga Reddi's village up the river). He asked Linga Reddi whether he thought the people were aware that an officer, high in the service of Government, had arrived to settle their grievances. Linga Reddi replied that he did not think they did know, and that if they did, they didn't care, as at present their minds were given up to fighting! I will write again when I have more to tell you; but I fear that little can be done until the country has quieted down a bit. I won't waste any time, but Government will understand that the matter cannot be settled off hand.

The clerks I have brought with me from the Board are mere copyists. I much feel the want of an experienced man of some age and standing whom I can employ confidentially, and such a man is Raja Rao, the Sub-Collector's Sheristadar, and lately Acting Deputy Collector. He is now on leave, but is prepared to cancel it if again made Acting Deputy Collector. I should feel much obliged if Government would attach him to me in that capacity for a time. In anticipation I am going to employ him, and if Government decline to sanction the appointment, I will make up the difference of his salary myself. I must have a man of this sort to overhaul the Mansabdar's accounts.

As a last word, let me reiterate that the first and most important step towards pacifying the people is to get rid of the Mansabdar and his intrigues.

July 27th.—The despatch of this has been delayed owing to my not having been able to get the enclosures copied in time. Yesterday information was received of two parties of insurgents being out not far from where I was going to camp; one party attempted to loot a village in the vicinity, but were beaten off by the police. If I were to go out there now, it would necessitate my applying for a guard for my camp, and as there are no men to spare I have changed my plans. I am going up the river to-morrow to Linga Reddi's village, Konda-Modalu, in the hope of getting him to make known my arrival and the object of my visit to such of the mootahdars who may not be out on 'fituri.'

Robertson, in a letter which arrived this morning, says: "I think now as I did months ago that some decided action of Government as to the future of Rampa as a Zemindari must precede any settlement of the country."

A.

MEMORANDUM.

On the 30th March 1878, the Mansabdar of Rampa addressed a petition to the Sub-Collector, stating that Pallala Muthialamma, Mootahdar of Vélamoor, died on 2nd March 1878; that she has no legal heirs; and that therefore the mootah should come under his management in accordance with the custom and practice of his (Mansabdar's) estate, and with reference to the rules prescribed by the Board of Revenue. Mansabdar requests sanction to bring the mootah under his management and to local cess being levied from him on account of this mootah. This petition was referred by the Sub-Collector to the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry who referred it to the Deputy Tahsildar of Kotapalli for inquiry.

On 28th May 1878 one Pallala Ramireddi presented a petition before the Deputy Tahsildar of Kottapalli. In this petition Ramireddi objects to the claim of the Mansabdar. Ramireddi states that the mootah has been in the enjoyment of the family from his forefathers. His father, Ramireddi, died nine years ago. He was then a minor, and consequently Muthialamma, Ramireddi's second widow, managed the mootah, his eldest wife having previously died. Muthialamma died three months ago. His father, late Ramireddi, had three wives. The first wife, Yerramma, with whom he had a legal marriage died childless before petitioner, Ramireddi, was born. The second wife, Muthialamma, and the third, Pandamma, had been married by his father with the consent of the caste people. Muthialamma has two daughters, Subbamma and Sunbhamma, of twenty-five years old, being twins. These two are living with their husbands. Subbamma is at Kundada and Sunbhamma at Vélamoor with Muthialamma, and even after Muthialamma's death. Subbamma has four daughters and Sunbhamma none. Petitioner, Ramireddi, and his brother Mutyalareddi are the only sons of Pandamma. Petitioner is twenty-seven years old and his brother twenty-five. Petitioner has no sisters. During the late Ramireddi's lifetime, he kept Muthialamma at Vélamoor and Pandamma at Gajjanamidivalasoo and maintained them. Petitioner and his brother, as well as his mother, were under the support of Muthialamma. Petitioner's mother died two months before the date of the petition. Petitioner says he is supporting the family of Muthialamma and his own. Petitioner and his brother are undivided. Petitioner claims the mootah as he and his brother are the heirs of their father and mothers, and requests that they (brothers) may be placed in possession of the mootah and the usual peishcush (Rs. 40) may be ordered to be collected from them by the Mansabdar. Petitioner Ramireddi called some witnesses to prove that at the time of Muthialamma's death, she told him to manage the estate and made over to him her personal property; that late Ramireddi recognised his (petitioner's) mother with the consent of the caste people as his wife. Petitioner Ramireddi adds that Maddati Chinnanna married first his mother Pandamma and left her; afterwards she married Tatikonda Baladu; after some time she did not like Baladu and went to Vélamoor where the Mootahdar Ramireddi kept her. Ramireddi says he performed the funeral rites of Ramireddi, his father and Muthialamma.

On 31st May, Mansabdar's Vakeel gave a statement before the Deputy Tahsildar. In this he states as follows:—The claimants, Ramireddi and his brother Mutyalareddi, are not the proper heirs of the late Mootahdar. Ramireddi's first wife, Yerramma, died thirty years ago. She was childless. After her death the last holder, Muthialamma, was married. She left only daughters. When nine years ago Mootahdar Ramireddi died the claimants, Ramireddi and Mutyalareddi, were twenty and eighteen years, respectively. Mootahdar Ramireddi had not married her lawfully. On one occasion the Mootahdar came to the Mansabdar when Pandamma was maid servant of the Mansabdar, and was living in adultery and had not been married; she had daughters; Mootahdar then took her with him, promising to support her, and kept her at Gajjanamidivalasoo, and by him she had the claimant Ramireddi and his brother. The Vakeel argues that the estate was managed by Muthialamma, because, though Ramireddi and his brother were old enough, they were not the legal heirs when the Mootahdar Ramireddi died. Vakeel cites Kanni, who was born to Pandamma when she was in the service of the Mansabdar, and other witnesses; Vakeel asserts that when Muthialamma died she had made over her personal property to her second daughter Sunbhamma; that Ramireddi and his brother had never been under her (Muthialamma's) support; that the brothers did not come at the time of her death; that her property was not made over to them; and that she did not tell them to manage the mootah. He called some witnesses to prove the above points, and the fact that the Mootahdar did not marry their mother Pandamma.

Pallala Mutyalareddi states that he and his brother Ramireddi are the sons of Pandamma, who was kept by Vélamoor Ramireddi: that both brothers are undivided, and that he joined his brother in claiming the mootah.

Mansabdar's first witness Kanni states that Pandamma is her mother; that when her father Tatikonda Baladu died, her mother left her in the Divunam of the Mansabdar and went away to Vélamoor where the Mootahdar kept her; and that by him her mother has the claimants Ramireddi and Mutyalareddi.

Second witness Sankuru Chitukulu states that Pandamma was first kept by Maddati Chinnanna and then by Tatikonda Baladu; that on Baladu's death she went to Vélamoor where Mootahdar kept her; that the claimants were born to him; that in the hills (manyem) though women were kept they are recognised as married wives; that Mootahdar had first married a woman, she died and then kept the two women; that Pandamma had none when kept by Baladu. At that time the Mansabdar was residing in Rampa; that Pandamma had no issue when she went to the Mootahdar Ramireddi.

Third witness Kalapureddi Veerabhadrudu; he is a peon of the Mansabdar. He says that when he went to make collections he was informed that Muthialamma was seriously ill, and he went to Vélamoor; that there her two daughters were crying by her, that Muthialamma said to them 'why do you cry,' 'take all the property, Mansabdar will take charge of the mootah;' that then claimant Ramireddi and his brother were not present there, and that he does not know

where they were. Claimant Ramireddi's first witness, Pallala Bhapireddi *alias* Bodulur Bhapireddi, states that the Mootahdar Ramireddi married a woman, and then kept the other two; that Muthialamma has two daughters, and the claimant Ramireddi and his brother were born to Pandamma; that when Mootahdar Ramireddi died the claimant Ramireddi were sufficiently old, but he does not know why Muthialamma managed the mootah; that during the lifetime of the Mootahdar and Muthialamma they had been living at Vélamoor and claimant Ramireddi and his brother at Gajjamamidivalasoo; that he was not present when Muthialamma died, and does not know how she disposed of her personal and real property; that in the hills (Manyem) when a man keeps a woman she is recognized as his married wife; and that the claimant Ramireddi's mother Pandamma lived with the Mootahdar as his married wife; that Pandamma was at first the wife of Tatikonda Baladu by whom she had a daughter Kannamma who is now in the Divunam of the Rampa Mansabdar; that Muthialamma was at first the wife of Pandarantudu, of Gammalladiddipalam, and on his death Mootahdar Ramireddi kept her.

Second witness, Madigupentadu *alias* Chitukapentadu, states that he was present when Muthialamma died at Vélamoor; that she did not hear what she said of the mootah as he (deponant) was off at the house; that the claimant Ramireddi and his brother are the sons of the Mootahdar Ramireddi; that Muthialamma and Ramireddi (Mootahdar) were living in Vélamoor and the claimant and his brother and mother at Gajjamamidivalasoo and that he does not know whether claimant's mother and Muthialamma are the Mootahdar's married wives or kept women.

Third witness, Suruboyama Bhamadu, states that the claimant's mother and Muthialamma are the kept women of the Mootahdar Ramireddi; that he was present when Muthialamma died at Vélamoor; that she does not know whom she told to manage the mootah at the time of her death and to whom her personal property was made over; that in their (Manyem) hills it is only the rich that contract legal marriages. Many persons keep woman who live as wives. So Pandamma lived with Ramireddi as married woman.

On 10th September 1878, Kolla Sunbhamma, second daughter of the Mootahdar Ramireddi and Muthialamma presented a petition before the Deputy Tahsildar stating the circumstances of the family, and claiming the mootah for herself since her sister has some estate, Kundada Mootah, to live; she states also that the Mootahdar Ramireddi left instructions, to make over the whole property and the mootah to her after Muthialamma's death; that at the time of Muthialamma's death she accordingly made over to her the property as well as the estate; that Pandamma and her two sons Ramireddi and Mutyalareddi had been under the support of her father and mother during their lifetime; that they as well as petitioner Sunbhamma and her husband are living as undivided family. She wants the estate, because she is a daughter of the first widow of Ramireddi. She promises to support the claimants if the mootah is made over to her, or else the mootah may, she says, be made over to the eldest son Ramireddi, though they are sons of second wife as they are male heirs, and Ramireddi will support her and her husband. She finally says that it is lawful to give the mootah either to her or to the sons of Ramireddi, and that it will be known that while there are heirs it will be improper for the Mansabdar to ask permission to take the mootah under his management.

Mansabdar filed copy of the Board's Proceedings, dated 19th August 1872, to support his claim.

Deputy Tahsildar states that the fact that the claimants are the sons of a kept woman has been proved by the evidence adduced on both sides. He observes that in hill-village, real marriages were scarce; that the kept woman live as married wives; that the second and third wives were under Ramireddi's support, and have equal right; but when he died the management of the mootah was assumed and conducted by Muthialamma, though there are two sons of Pandamma. During her management, though the present claimant Ramireddi was not a man of discretion, he was not so during the nine years the mootah was under her; still he does not appear to have prevented Muthialamma. Deputy Tahsildar leaves it to be determined whether the sons are or not the proper heirs of the Mootahdar Ramireddi.

Family Tree of

Pallala Ramireddi, Mootahdar of Vélamoor.

- Yerramma, 1st wife, by legal marriage.
  - Childless.
- Muthialamma, 2nd wife, (kept woman.)
  - Subbamma, 1st daughter.
  - Kolla Sunbhamma, 2nd daughter.
- Pandamma, 3rd wife, by (kept woman.)
  - Ramireddi, 1st son.
  - Mutyalareddi, 2nd son.

B.

Karem Potti Dora states: Chelankuri Venkatarayudu, toddy-renter, imposed Chiguru Pannu since last year. For each village Rs. 7 are charged. I live in Mulapilli in Bandapilli Mootah. It is four miles distant to Birampilli Mootah. Mansabdar has also demanded Modallu Pannu, which is also Rs. 7 a village. The mootah consists of forty villages. Mootahdar died twenty years ago, and the mootah since then is being managed by the Mansabdar. It is Chiguru Pannu that compelled all the Paddas to take this trouble. It is never collected since the creation. The peons of the toddy-renter came to us and compelled payment. Peons generally extort 4 annas each time, besides that, rice, curry, and fowls are also extorted.

The head constable or constable comes to each village for Pongul and Dasara, and take from us 8 annas for each village. The headman also gives to the said constable one seer of rice, one or two fowls, dholl, ghee, &c., whenever he visits the village.

I can say that for Dasara 8 annas are taken by the police; we were afraid to complain to officers.

The headman of my village, named Karem Tammandora, paid 8 annas to the head constable or constable for each Dasara. This Tammandora is not the man that is doing all the mischief.

Karem Potti Dora, brother of Tammandora, states: I am the brother of Tammandora; I have been in bad terms with him since ten years. I do not know why my brother and others are committing this disturbance. I hear Jatta Papayya, the sub-renter of Kottapalli, imposed toddy tax. I do not know any thing more.

Jatta Papayya demanded Rs. 10 for every balla. We have not been drawing toddy for three years, because of the above tax. My brother and others are causing this disturbance on account of the above tax.

I hear the head constable that was killed took bribes from every village at Rs. 10 each, threatening he would imprison them. This he did before the fituri began.

(1) Damla Soami of Gangaram, (2) Kota Tammayya of Geddavaru, (3) Mulla Seshayya of Bodulur. These three men seized the said head constable in Devarapalli and beat him with hands. About 200 men have also joined them. I was also present with them I did not beat the head constable. My brother Tammandora was also present; he did not take part in beating the head constable. The head constable was not then killed; I was not present when he was killed.

I was asked by Padiem Narsadu, of Nandivada, to accompany him to Devarapilli, as he has to go there on his own business.

The head constable was taken from Devarapilli to Bodulur, I did not go to Bodulur.

Karem Gangadu, Mootahdar of Birampalli states: I am the Mootahdar of Birampalli. The toddy sub-renters Reddam Subbarayudu and Chelankuri Venkatarayudu imposed toddy tax of Rs. 60 a year three years ago. I paid Rs. 60 a year for three years on the whole mootah. My mootah consists of ten villages. There are 200 Palmyra trees in my village Birampalli; and in other villages there are but few trees. As we have not been able to pay the said toddy tax we have left off drawing toddy this year. I think and hear that Karem Tammadu and others have committed the disturbance on account of the above tax.

The Sitanagaram, Kottapilli and Gokavaram merchants have also oppressed some of the Koyas great deal by charging heavy interest, &c. For instance, the Sitanagaram merchant, Palapu Bhamayya, attached forty cattle of my brother five years ago, as the latter had to give the former one Yedum of Gingelly seed. Two police constables, whose names I cannot tell, accompanied Bhamayya; the cattle was attached in my brother's absence; my brother's name is Pandu Dora.

I do not know if the Mansabdar oppressed any of the villagers.

I am only paying Rs. 40 to the Mansabdar and nothing more.

For every Dasara I am paying Rs. 4 to the police constables. They come to my village on the Dasara day; head constable accompanied by a constable comes to my village. They now and then ask for a fowl.

All the hillmen are dissatisfied on account of the toddy tax. Rs. 150 are charged on Bandapilli mootah on account of toddy tax. Similarly every mootah is charged.

I took no part in the rebellion.

Karem Tammadu, Nedamurireddi, Bodulur Ammalareddi, Maredubillireddi, Yelukurireddi, Kakurireddi, Dora Chintalapalep Buchayya, took leading part in the rebellion. I have merely heard they are ringleaders, but I have seen nothing with my own eyes.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of the Godavari District, to the Collector of the Godavari District, dated Rajahmundry, 12th June 1871, No. 116.

I have the honor to forward to you the records connected with an inquiry held by me into two complaints made against the Mansabdar of Rampa.

2. The first case was inquired into in consequence of a reference from you on a demi-official received by you from the Superintendent of Police. The second case is the result of an inquiry held on a complaint preferred to me some weeks ago. In one of these cases the Rampa Mansabdar is accused of having extorted money from the head of a village, and in the other of having extorted a bond promising to pay a rent for a village which had hitherto been held rent free.

3. The records in my office regarding the Rampa Estate are very few, and I am therefore not able to give every detail regarding its settlement; but I think that the following remarks will be found correct.

4. The Mansabdar's Jaghire was granted to him on condition of furnishing the former Native Government with a military equipment. His revenues are derived from a tax levied from certain villages in the Rampa Estate, and from other villages in the vicinity of Gokaram and Koregonda. Some years ago the condition of a military equipment was done away with, and compounded for a money-payment, and the Mansabdar now holds his Jaghire on the payment of a yearly rent to Government of Rs. 1,458. This sum is not, however, actually paid by him, for in consideration of his binding himself not to collect certain abkari and sayer duties, the Government engaged to pay him yearly the average value of them. This average value was fixed at Rs. 2,192-11-8. The sum payable by the Mansabdar was deducted, and the balance, *viz.*, Rs. 735 is paid to the Mansabdar by the Government yearly.

In 1841, December 21st, in the time of the Collector, Mr. Smith, there was considerable dissatisfaction amongst the Mootahdars of the several villages in Rampa which pay tax to the Mansabdar. These Mootahdars appear to have a proprietory right in the land attached to the villages, and this right is a hereditary one. They complained that the tax they had to pay was too heavy, and after their claims had been duly considered Mr. Smith reduced the tax that each had to pay by about one-half. In 1848 in the time of Mr. Collector Prendergast this settlement has been further reduced in consequence of a continued dissatisfaction which had increased to such a pitch that some of the Mootahdars broke into open rebellion, and were brought to order only after severe measures had been used. Table "A" shows the amount demanded from the respective villages before Mr. Smith's time, the amount of tax settled by Mr. Smith, and the amount to which it was afterwards reduced by Mr. Prendergast. From 1840 to 1848 the estate was under the management of the Court of Wards owing to the death of the late and the minority of the present Mansabdar.

5. From the above I gather,—supposing that I am correct in my facts,—that the Mansabdar has no proprietory right in the land in the Rampa country but that he is only entitled to collect certain taxes which have been definitely fixed for certain villages; and that it is not in his power either to increase those taxes or levy taxes from any other villages other than those mentioned. In 1865 a doubt arose whether the Mansabdar was entitled to recover arrears of taxes due to him by an ordinary revenue suit, and the Board passed an order, No. 300, dated 18th January 1865, referring the Mansabdar's claims to the Collector for settlement. In 1869 in consequence of an application from the Mansabdar, he was told under orders from you that for all old arrears he must bring a suit before the Civil Courts. The question as to whether he was empowered to take proceedings under Act VIII of 1865 (Rent Recovery Act) was left unanswered.

6. It now appears that the Mansabdar does not confine himself to the collection of the rents from each village as laid down by Mr. Prendergast, but that he is in the habit of collecting additional tax on account of fruit-trees and pasture lands, amounting in some cases to as much as treble the amount fixed by Mr. Prendergast. Table "B" shows these amounts, which the Mansabdar acknowledges that he collects; indeed, he considers himself entitled to collect them, for he produced a bond by which the villagers bound themselves to pay their sums, and another document which is a statement of the villagers that the bond was freely and voluntarily given. It must be remembered that these Rampa villagers are a wild ignorant hill tribes, and it appears difficult to me to understand why, if they created a disturbance in the time of Mr. Prendergast, because the rates were too high, they should, when the estate was resumed by the present Mansabdar, have voluntarily consented to pay what they formerly refused to. That they have any especial love towards the Mansabdar as a landholder and their head cannot be urged because it was against him that they rose on the several different occasions and not against the Government. In case No. 1, the particulars are as follow:—Five months ago the old Reddy of Vélamoor died. Four days after his death the Mansabdar's peons came to the village and stated that the Mansabdar was going to attach the late Reddy's property for arrears. From the statement of the young Reddy it appears that the rent of the village of Vélamoor is Rs. 40, but that this sum was never paid,

NOTE.—Memorandum B shows that in these villages they have refused to pay this extra assessment.

because the family held an Inam to the same amount in Gokaram which was in the possession of the Mansabdar, and who thus took the value of the Inam as the amount of* the rent of Vélamoor. After holding out this threat the peons went away. In the mean time the Mansabdar's Vakeel Venkayer applied to the Sub-Magistrate of Kolapully to give him an order to the police to grant him assistance in the distraining of the Vélamoor Reddy's property. An order was given to the station officer of Sodaveram who endorsed it to the station officer of Dondada, who however excused himself on the ground that he was sick, and that his constables would not obey his orders. The Vakeel then went to Vélamoor accompanied by a Mussulman peon. It appears to me as well as to the Superintendent of Police that the Vakeel never really wanted the police to accompany him, but that the order was asked for, so as to be used as a means of threatening the Reddy. Arrived at Vélamoor the Vakeel asked the widow of the Reddy to pay the arrears owed by her late husband, *viz.*, Rs. 200, *i.e.*, Rs. 100 for the current fasli, Rs. 50 arrears for the previous one, and Rs. 50 arrears for the fasli before. She refused on the ground that no arrears were due. Venkayer then told her that if she did not pay he would fetch the police from the station who would put them in the stocks and bring them down to Rajahmundry. He then wrote a letter to the station officer (*vide* deposition of the servant), but did not despatch it. The Vakeel then asked for a present for himself of Rs. 50 which sum was lent to the widow by her son-in-law who was working in the fields at the time, and who was fetched for this purpose by the young Reddy. After lending the Rs. 50, the son-in-law is said to have returned to his work. In addition to the Rs. 50 given to Venkayer the widow gave Rs. 4 to the peon who accompanied him. Venkayer is then said to have gone inside the house, leaving the widow, the young Reddy and the servant outside in the custody of the peon. He then came out with a box which contained a gold chain and some cloths; the chain he took and put round his neck, the cloths he returned. Venkayer then untied a horse which belonged to the Reddy; he bridled and mounted it; and telling the servant to follow and drive two bullocks (also the Reddy's property), he went off to Errampaliem, the Mansabdar's head-quarters, followed by the young Reddy and the servant. On the way the young Reddy met a friend to whom he told the demand of the Vakeel Venkayer, and from whom he borrowed Rs. 200 to meet the claim. That night they stopped in the village of Godada, and on the following morning reached Errampaliem. Arrived at Errampaliem the Vakeel first took them to the house of one of the Mansabdar's peons where the horse and bullocks were left, and then to the Mansabdar's house. Here the money was paid and a receipt† given for Rs. 200. The servant states that he saw the Vakeel give the gold chain to the Mansabdar's son who was there. The value of the chain is said to be Rs. 100. This is the story of the Reddy and his servant as recorded in their depositions and corroborated by the widow, whose deposition was not recorded as it only referred to some particulars, and because she was a particularly ignorant woman, who had never before seen a white face, and whose statement was of a very wandering and rigmarole character. This statement is, of course, denied by Venkayer who admits, however, that he got Rs. 200, namely, Rs. 100 for the current fasli and Rs. 100 for arrears of two former faslis. He states, however, that when he applied for the assistance of the police he had no intention of distraining for the old balance, but only for that of the current fasli, and when he asked for the current demand the widow voluntarily gave the old arrears. The receipt is admitted.

* The Mansabdar denies that this Inam belongs to the Vélamoor people; but I am inclined to believe their statement, because on going over the accounts, I find entries crediting Rs. 40 on account of the Gokaram Inam to the Reddy of Vélamoor.

† An unstamped paper.

7. It is perfectly clear that immediately after the old Reddy's death, steps were taken to distrain the property; that the assistance of the police was applied for when there was no reason to expect resistance; and that under these circumstances the demand made for the current fasli and also the alleged arrears for former faslis were collected. It is also clear that the rent of Vélamoor as fixed by Mr. Prendergast was Rs. 40, and that the Mansabdar now claims a tax for fruit-trees of Rs. 60 which tax, he says, the late Reddy voluntarily agreed to give. Now if this fruit-tree tax was a voluntary one of the late Reddy, it does not appear to me that it can be binding on his son, who certainly now, in my presence, denies his wish to pay it. Whether it was voluntary or not is open to grave doubt, but in any case it cannot be held that the non-payment of a voluntary subscription can be collected as an arrear of rent under Act VIII of 1865. As regards‡ the story of the chain and the horse and the bullocks there is no absolute proof that this is true. I am, however, inclined to believe it, for these hill-people are almost too uncultivated to lie wilfully. It is clear that the Vakeel went to Vélamoor with the purpose of distraining; and I think, therefore, that it is not unreasonable to suppose that he did distrain something. The receipt shows that Rs. 200 was paid, and if this was paid what became of the distrained property about which the Vakeel denies all knowledge.

‡ NOTE.—It also appears that under the threat of distraining for what was alleged to be current arrears, the young Reddy was induced to pay the arrears, for two former faslis. Under Act VIII of 1865, distraint can only be made for arrears of one year or under. For older balances an ordinary civil suit must be brought.

8. This case was first brought to notice by Inspector Williams to whom the young Reddy told his story in a great state of excitement. It appears that the young Reddy was

under the idea that the Vakeel was acting under an order from the Sub-Collector; indeed, he told Inspector Williams so. He was excited, but was too ignorant to know how to obtain redress against what he considered to be an official order.

9. As regards the second case the complainant is also a widow. Her husband was the Reddi of the Pentapully village. She states that he died eight years ago. Her husband was also the Mootahdar of Mussaramully which is entered in Mr. Prendergast's last settlement as paying a kist of Rs. 40. To this kist, however, has recently been added a kist for fruit-trees and pasturage, and the village now pays Rs. 140 annually. The village of Pentapully is not entered in the settlement of Mr. Prendergast, and the widow declares that it is a mocassa village which her husband's family had always held rent free. About two or three months ago the widow was summoned to Errampalem by one of the Mansabdar's peons, and was asked to give a muchilika to pay Rs. 300 annually to the Mansabdar for the village of Pentapully. This she states she refused to do, because she had always hitherto held the village on *mocassa tenure*. The Mansabdar's Vakeel, however, then told her in the presence of the Mansabdar and his eldest son that if she did not give this muchilika she would be beaten and confined. She was then put into a room adjoining the hall, and a paper was written out by the Village Curnam. This paper she was asked to sign or rather to touch with the pen, but she refused and the Vakeel Venkayer then touched her with the pen and entered it on the paper, the Village Munsif then signing the same as a witness. The woman was then sent back to her village, but she at once came to me to Vadapally and lodged a complaint.* I caused certain inquiries to be made regarding this complaint, and having discovered that it seemed to be true, I inquired into it at the same time as Case No. I. In support of the woman's statement there are three witnesses who had come to the Mansabdar's house for various reasons and said the transaction as above related. They corroborate the woman's statement. The Mansabdar produced the muchilika said to have been extorted, but urges that the woman gave this muchilika voluntarily, and that from time immemorial the village of Pentapully has paid a kist of Rs. 300. The woman produced a document, dated 15th January 1849, in which the Mansabdar acknowledges the village to be a mocassa village and paying no kist. The Mansabdar, however, denies that the signature to this document is authentic. In proof of the Mansabdar's statements he produced his accounts for the last twenty years in each of which years he urged that an entry of the payment of the kist would be found. I have examined these accounts very carefully, and I find that what he says is partly true. An entry is made every year that the kist of Pentapully (variously entered as Rs. 300 and 400) has been paid by the woman's husband and another, but in the next entry on the debit side I find invariably an entry to the effect that the whole of the kist on account of Pentapully has been remitted on account of Sirdar duties. Indeed, in one entry the village is called a mocassa village. These entries continue every year until six years ago when the woman's husband's name disappears and entries of Rs. 40 and 80 are found as having been paid by the villagers on account of kist, with no corresponding entry of remission. In one year, however, (Fasli 1279 two years ago) the entry of kist of Rs. 300 is again made, and the corresponding refund entry is made not on account of Sirdar duties, but on account of presents and cloths given to the woman Pandamma. I think it is very clear that these entries are not entries of money paid or received, and that in reality the village was held rent free; these dummy entries being made to keep up a show of a title. It is clear that the Mansabdar's statement that Pentapully has always paid a tax of Rs. 300 is false, and that it never has done so. It is also clear that the muchilika admitted by the Mansabdar to have been voluntarily signed by the woman is an improper and illegal one, for it is on plain paper. Several receipts granted by the Mansabdar form part of the records; these are all on plain paper, and I am of opinion that it will be found that it is the Mansabdar's usual practice to evade the Stamp Act, which it is easy for him to do since the people are so ignorant that they do not know the value or the penalties connected with a stamp.

* The widow does not complain that she has up to this time been called upon to pay the woman. She complains only that the muchilika was extorted from her.

10. After a careful inquiry my opinion is that the Mansabdar has committed many and great irregularities, and that there are many other irregularities, and oppression of a similar nature which have not come to light. You are probably better aware than I am of the feeling of excitement which this conduct is calculated to raise amongst these ignorant hill villagers; and I am strongly of opinion that it is necessary that strong measures should be adopted by you to prevent a repetition of these acts.

11. You will observe that the original Rampa estate consists of twenty-five villages at a settled kist of Rs. 1,000. Under the present arrangement the Mansabdar levies from twenty-four of these a kist of Rs. 2,110.† The village of Pentapully is not at all mentioned in Mr. Prendergast's settlement.

† Being Rs. 1,000 Mr. Prendergast's.
„ 1,110 Settlement.
„ 2,110 Fruit-tax.

12. I have taken no steps regarding the breaches of the Stamp Act committed by the Mansabdar, but await your instructions on the whole case.

Initials of Mr. J. D. B. GRIBBLE.

P.S.—The accounts of the Mansabdar are not forwarded with this letter. Should you require them I will forward them hereafter. I have sent for the Mansabdar a second time in order to give me an explanation regarding certain entries. I found in them of large sums of money given at various times to the Revenue subordinates and Clerks of the Head Assistant Collector's cutcherry. A report regarding this matter, together with the Tahsildar's and Mansabdar's explanations will be forwarded to you in the course of a few days.

———

A.

STATEMENT showing the Amount demanded from the Mootahdars of the Rampa Mansabdar before Mr. Smith's time, that settled to be paid by Mr. Smith, and latterly by Mr. Prendergast in 1848.

Names of Mootahs.	Amounts demanded before Mr. Smith's settlement.			1841; Amount settled by Mr. Smith to be paid by Mootahdars to the Mansabdar.			1848; Amount settled by Mr. Prendergast to be paid by Mootahdars to the Mansabdar.			Remarks.
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	
1. Bandapilli ...	250	0	0	121	4	0	40	0	0	Under the Mansabdar's direct management, the Mootahdar having been transported for life.
2. Birampilli ...	250	0	0	141	4	0	40	0	0	
3. Musurumilli ...	150	0	0	94	12	0	40	0	0	
4. Valogapilli ...	150	0	0	94	12	0	40	0	0	
5. Choppakonda ...	30	0	0	17	0	0	20	0	0	Under the Mansabdar's direct management, the Mootahdar having been transported for life.
6. Gaddada ...	...			...			20	0	0	
7. Bolugonda ...	...			...			40	0	0	Under the Mansabdar's direct management, the Mootahdar having given the mootah to the former.
8. Tadipilli ...	...			...			40	0	0	Mootahdar died without heirs and the mootah is managed by the Mansabdar.
9. Vemulakonda ...	200	0	0	113	0	0	25	0	0	
10. Nadunur ...	150	0	0	84	12	0	40	0	0	
11. Chidugur ...	100	0	0	56	8	0	40	0	0	
12. Kundada ...	80	0	0	45	8	0	20	0	0	
13. Maredumilli ...	100	0	0	56	8	0	20	0	0	
14. Vadukur ...	100	0	0	56	8	0	40	0	0	
15. Vélamoor ...	200	0	0	113	0	0	40	0	0	
16. Pamuler ...	100	0	0	56	8	0	25	0	0	
17. Bodulur ...	180	0	0	101	12	0	40	0	0	
18. Kakur ...	200	0	0	113	0	0	25	0	0	
19. Chavala ...	...			...			30	0	0	
20. Kota ...	600	0	0	339	0	0	260	0	0	
21. Pandraprole ...	200	0	0	113	0	0	50	0	0	
22. Dorachintapalem	300	0	0	169	0	0	40	0	0	Under the Mansabdar's management, the Mootahdar having died without heirs.
23. Mohanapuram ...	...			...			25	0	0	
Total ...	3,340	0	0	1,887	0	0	1,000	0	0	

N.B.—Rampa and Thunnur Mootahs were not settled before Mr. Prendergast's, but left under Mansabdar's management.

GODAVARI DISTRICT, RAJAHMUNDRY,
12th June 1871,

(Signed) J. D. B. GRIBBLE,
Acting Sub-Collector.

B.

MEMORANDUM showing the Amount of additional Tax imposed by the Mansabdar on the Mootahdars on account of Fruit-trees.

		Amount of Fruit-tax.
1.	Bandapilli	Under Mansabdar's management.
2.	Birampilli	90
3.	Musurumilli	100
4.	Valogopilli	100
5.	Choppakonda	Under Mansabdar's management.
6.	Gaddada	72
7.	Bolugonda	Under Mansabdar's management.
8.	Tadipilli	100
9.	Vemulakonda	50
10.	Naduaur	90
11.	Chidugur	20
12.	Kundada	68
13.	Maredumilli	60
14.	Vadukur	80
15.	Vémaloor	60
16.	Pamuler	30
17.	Bodulur	70
18.	Kakur	60
19.	Chavala	60
20.	Kota	Mootahdars refused to pay fruit-tax.
21.	Pandraprole	Mootahdars refused to pay fruit-tax.
22.	Dorachintapalem	Under Mansabdar's management.
23.	Mohanapuram	Mootahdar refused to pay fruit-tax.

GODAVARI DISTRICT,
12th June 1871.

(Signed) J. D. B. GRIBBLE,
Acting Sub-Collector.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of the Godavari District, to the Collector of the Godavari District, dated Rajahmundry, 17th June 1871, No. 118.

With reference to my letter, No. 116, of the 12th instant, I have the honor herewith to forward two orders sent by the Mansabdar in order to establish his claim to levy a tax on timber and pasturage lands. The orders do not, as far as I can see, prove anything and convey no sanction whatever to levy an extra tax. That from Mr. Purvis refers only to a magisterial complaint, and gives no final orders whatsoever, and the one from the Head Assistant Collector Mr. Moloney could give no right to levy a tax which had not been previously sanctioned.

The fact that the Mansabdar can bring forward no better authority for levying this tax, the assessment on the respective mootahs having previously been permanently settled by Mr. Prendergast appears to me to be conclusive that his claim is an improper one.

From J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavari District, to the Acting Sub-Collector of the Godavari District, dated Cocanada, 23rd June 1871, No. 102.

I have the honor to acknowledge your letters, Nos. 116 and 118, dated 12th and 17th instant, respectively, reporting the result of your investigation into the complaints brought against the Mansabdar of Rampa by two of the Mootahdars.

The charges are—

1. That the Mansabdar's Vakeel illegally seized certain property belonging to Ramireddi Mootahdar of Vélamoor; extorted for himself and peon a present and levied Rs. 200 on account of rent of fruit-trees.
2. That the Mansabdar extorted an agreement from Pandamma, widow of the Mootahdar of Musurumilli, to pay a certain sum annually on account of rent of Pentapilli a Mocassa village held free of assessment.

2. In the case of Vélamoor I observe that it is one of the villages mentioned in the agreement entered into by the Mansabdar with his Mootahdars, the payment stipulated being Rs. 40 a year. It was an arrangement effected through the medium of the district officers with the full concurrence of both the contracting parties and the approval of Government.

3. Without entering minutely into the inquiry held by you, I shall confine myself to the main question arising from the case, viz., Has the Mansabdar a right to demand sums under

any name whatever from the Mootahdars over and above the amounts settled as rents by his agreement?

The Mansabdar has bound himself by an agreement, under date 22nd July 1847, forwarded to the Board of Revenue with the Collector's letter of 22nd June 1848, No. 73, not to levy a greater sist than that specified in the agreement. He also agreed not to levy any extra cesses such as "Nuzeranahs" Rusoms, presents for marriages, &c., Darbar and Sibhandy charges and fines for irregularities in casje."

For the non-observance of these and certain other conditions the Mansabdar agreed to submit himself to certain penalties, of which the following is an English translation:—

" * * * the Circar upon obtaining proof of any of these defects on my part may employ a sufficient number of servants for the discharge of the police duties, and resume for their salaries two of my villages called Rannelanka and Bheempalli for the first offence. Should I be guilty of a similar irregularity a second time, the Circar may resume my two other villages called Erlankapalli and Pentapalli which were formerly obtained from the proprietor of Corcondah Purgana." "Should it be proved that I have committed a like irregularity a third time, the Circar may resume my whole estate, and I will then bind myself to receive for maintenance such allowance as the Circar may determine."

4. The rent of fruit-trees in Vélamoor being part of the Mootahdar's income from land the Mansabdar has no right whatever to demand any sum above the stipulated Rs. 40, so long as the present agreement continues in force. This rule equally holds good in the case of all the Mootahdars named in the agreement.

The Mansabdar has no right to receive any extra cesses of any kind whatever as he appears to be doing now, *vide* receipt of the Mansabdar given to the Mootahdar of Musuramili on 7th December 1868.

5. In the case of Pentapalli it has to be decided whether it is a rent free Mocassa village or otherwise.

A mootah as is generally understood consists of more than one village, and this is the term used in the agreement, the persons holding them are Mootahdars. It appears to me that in the agreement the principal villages of the mootahs are mentioned, and that there are other villages included in them, but not specially mentioned in the agreement, for Rampa contains some hundreds of villages, and they are not all under the direct management of the Mansabdar. It will be a valuable guide in the settlement of future question if you will be good enough to obtain from the Mansabdar a list of what villages are included in each of the mootahs and then call on the Mootahdars to state whether it is a correct list, and if it is not, what the defects are. To return to the subject, Pentapalli, according to your showing, has paid no assessment whatever for years, and the Mansabdar's claim is inadmissible, and can be only established in a Court of law. A village of this name appears in the Mansabdar's agreement referred to above (paragraph 3). It is therein stated to be the property of the Mansabdar. I am not certain whether the village in question is the identical one or another of that name.

6. In conclusion, I have to request that you will send for the Mansabdar and warn him of the serious consequences likely to result from his oppressive and impolitic conduct towards his retainers. He will be held responsible for any disturbance of the peace which may be occasioned by such acts as have come under notice. He should be reminded that he has already broken the conditions of the agreement, and that he will incur the serious displeasure of Government if he continues to act thus.

7. I beg you will proceed against the parties who have transgressed against the Stamp law. A Power of Attorney to your Sheristadar will be sent for prosecuting the cases before you as Magistrate.

The enclosures of your letters under reply are herewith returned.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of the Godavari District, to the Collector, of the Godavari District, dated Rajahmundry, 20th June 1871, No. 117(*b*).

I have the honor to forward herewith certain accounts of the Rampa Mansabdar which were filed in my office in an inquiry on the revenue side concerning the collection of revenue in the Rampa Estate. The result of this inquiry has already been sent to you.

2. Whilst examining these accounts my attention was attracted by certain entries constantly occurring of money distributed to various public servants, some of whom are still employed, and some of whom have since deceased. These entries commence from almost the first year that the present Mansabdar took charge of the estate from the Court of Wards, and continue up to the present time. It must be remembered that these accounts are, in a great measure occasional; those accounts only were produced which contained entries which the Mansabdar considered would support his revenue claim, and the accounts are frequently those of a single month only. I did not consider that I was justified in calling upon the Mansabdar to produce

the whole of his accounts. Those which he had voluntarily produced, I examined for the purpose for which they had been produced. When, however, during the course of the examination I found entries regarding Government servants which required explanation, I called upon them to furnish it. I enclose a memorandum of the deposition given by the Mansabdar's Vakeel, and the explanation furnished by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry and the Kottapalli Sub-Magistrate.

The subjoined list shows a statement of the several sums I found entered in these occasional accounts as having been given to revenue and police subordinates. You will observe that the total amounts to Rs. 989-10-1; a great many of these entries are for small amounts paid to the police constables and the revenue peons. Some entries, however, are for large amount, and I allude especially to those of Faslis 1266 and 1277. In the former fasli these large amounts are entered apparently as a usual contribution, and correspond to one month's salary of the several officials. In the latter fasli the Vakeel states that he was summoned to Rajahmundry on account of his road cess accounts, and that he was detained there some time, and that he was only able at last to get away on payment of the sums entered. The Tahsildar urges in explanation that this cannot be true, because the road cess was estimated by the Deputy Tahsildar, and the accounts were sent by him to the Huzur. The Vakeel, however, states that in this year the accounts were returned by you to the Tahsildar for correction, and that this was the reason that he was summoned. Whether the accounts were returned for correction or not I cannot say; this will be known in your office. If they were so returned the Vakeel's story seems to have an air of truth as the names of both the Deputy Tahsildar and the Tahsildar are entered. The entry of Rs. 200 to Subba Rao is mentioned as "Mamool." The Vakeel, however, states that this was an extraordinary present, and obtained only through the pressure of the Head Clerk.

The Vakeel mentions another occasion when the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry obtained some money from him between Rs. 50 and 120, after threatening him with a magisterial charge. If his statement be true, and the statement of the peon Virabadradoo who speaks to carrying the money to the Tahsildar's house, this occasion must have been about the end of 1869. About that time I find that the Tahsildar had incurred the grave displeasure of Mr. Horsfall, the late Acting Sub-Collector, and was fined Rs. 10 for submitting a false report, which, had it been accepted by Mr. Horsfall, would have had the effect of diverting a quantity of water from Government fields to land belonging to the Mansabdar. The Vakeel states that he was frequently in Rajahmundry concerning this matter, and it appears not unreasonable to suppose that Mr. Horsfall was justified in thinking that the Tahsildar was playing into the Mansabdar's hands.

I cannot believe that all these entries are false entries. The unconcern exhibited by the Mansabdar and his statement that when he saw these entries and signed the accounts no surprise has excited convinces me that it is not an unusual thing for his agents to fee the Government servants. In inquiring into this matter no assistance of any kind was afforded to me by the Mansabdar and his Vakeel. The latter was prepared to furnish me with explanations regarding what I had discovered; but he would state nothing regarding anything else, and though he complained generally of the extortion of the Government servants, he would cite no particular instance. He stated plainly that if he was shown entries in the accounts, he would explain them, but unless the accounts were shown him his memory would entirely fail.

As regards his general conduct the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry has given me many grounds for dissatisfaction. He is extremely remiss in his collections, and was only lately ordered to make good Rs. 89, by you for the omission of that sum from the assessment of road cess in certain villages. I feel, however, that it would be out of place to go into such complaints here. The present charge against him must be taken on its merits. If it is considered to be true, he deserves removal. If it thought to be false other grounds of complaint I may have against him will not prove it true. The Tahsildar has a general reputation in the town of being considerably engaged in trade. It is a fact that a large row of godowns belong to him, and that he is in the habit of letting out for hire a number of bandies. In a recent case a man was charged with obstructing the road with merchandise lately landed. He urged in his excuse that no one was allowed to use any bandies except those belonging to the Tahsildar, and that as those had been engaged he was compelled to wait until they returned. The property owned by the Tahsildar and the merchandise he carries on is conducted generally in the name of his brother, a man who lives with him. I have received many complaints regarding the Tahsildar's injustice in the assessment of income-tax. Several appeals against his decisions I have had to reverse, and I have frequently had reason to remark severely on the arbitrary manner in which he assesses the people.

As regards the Kotapalli Sub-Magistrate I think it would be highly advisable to remove him to some other station. He has been in Kotapalli for many years, and I feel no doubt but what he has become too much mixed up in the affairs of the Mansabdar.

I have called upon Subba Rao, the Tahsildar of Peddapur, to furnish me with his explanation of the money said to have been given to him. This explanation will be forwarded to you when received. As, however, it cannot affect the case against the Rajahmundry Tahsildar, I forward this report before its arrival. If the entry concerning the Rajahmundry Tahsildar is considered true, the same opinion will, I presume, be held regarding that which affects Subba Rao.

STATEMENT showing the Sums entered as paid to Public Servants in the Accounts of the Rampa Estates.

In what Faslis' Accounts the entries are found.	Particulars of the Entries and the Names of Persons to whom paid as entered in the Accounts.	Amount paid as entered in the Accounts. RS. A. P.	Remarks.
Fasli 1266 ...	Batta to Peons of the Kottapalli Head of Police.	15 15 6	
	Head of Police and Amildar of Kottapalli named Subniviss Venkataramadoss Pantulu.	100 0 0	Removed from the service.
	His Gumastah, V. Reddi Pantulu ...	12 0 0	Dead.
	Do. N. Jagannadham ...	12 0 0	Dead.
	Samutdar Y. Venkatarayadu ...	15 0 0	Now employed as Revenue Inspector in the Rajahmundry Taluk.
	Amildar Subneviss Venkataramadoss Puntulu.	100 0 0	Removed from the service.
	Gumastah V. Reddi Pantulu ...	12 0 0	Dead.
	Do. N. Jagannadham ...	12 0 0	Dead.
	Samutdar Y. Venkatarayadu ...	15 0 0	Now employed as Revenue Inspector in the Rajahmundry Taluk.
	Batta to Police Peons and Head of Police of Kottapalli.	5 6 7	
Fasli 1268 ...	Collector's Jamadar	6 0 0	
	Do. Duffadar	6 0 0	
	Do. Peons who wear silver badges.	6 0 0	
	Do. Peons who wear brass badges.	6 0 0	
	Collector's Huzur Jamadar Subbaroyadu.	6 0 0	
	Police GumastahK. Gagannatham, &c.	20 0 0	Dead.
	Gagendrakhana Ramakristna Rao ...	10 0 0	Dead.
	Kotapalli Taluk Peon S. Baliah ...	4 0 0	
Fasli 1269 ...	Amildar of Kotapalli named B. Narrain Rao.	20 0 0	Dead.
	Gumastah V. Reddi Pantulu ...	10 0 0	Dead.
Fasli 1274 ...	Peon of Rajahmundry Taluk named Y. Ramasawmy.	2 0 0	
	Peon of Rajahmundry Taluk named Narasimpulu.	0 8 0	
Fasli 1277 ...	Gokaram Station Constables ...	3 0 0	
	Gumastah V. Bayanna	10 0 0	Dead.
	Gumastah P. Perraz	10 0 0	Now employed as Gumastah in Rajahmundry Taluk.
	Do. M. Gururaz	20 0 0	Do.
	Tahsildar of Rajahmundry Taluk named Paniharam Venkataranga Charlu.	100 0 0	Now employed in the same post.
	Duffadars and Peons	4 0 0	
	Sub-Magistrate of Kotapalli K. Venkataragaviah.	150 0 0	Now employed in the same post.
	His Gumastah P. Prakasam ...	30 0 0	Do.
	Head Assistant Collector's Head Clerk P. Subba Rao.	200 0 0	Now employed as Tahsildar of Peddapur.
	Batta of the Sub-Magistrate, &c. ...	42 8 0	
Fasli 1278 ...	Mallaveram station people	1 8 0	
	Gokaram do.	3 0 0	
	Head Assistant Collector's Peons ...	4 0 0	
	Rajahmundry Taluk Peons	1 12 0	

STATEMENT showing the Sums entered as paid to Public Servants, &c.—(*Continued.*)

In what Faslis' Accounts the entries are found.	Particulars of the Entries and the Names of Persons to whom paid as entered in the Accounts.	Amount paid as entered in the Accounts. RS. A. P.	Remarks.
Fasli 1279 ...	Private servants of the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry.	3 0 0	
	Gumastah M. Gururaz	10 0 0	Now employed as Gumastah in Rajahmundry Taluk.
	Chodaveram Station Constables ...	3 0 0	
	Gokaram do. ...	3 0 0	
	Kotapalli Sub-Magistrate's Peons ...	2 0 0	
	Sub-Collector's Huzur Daloyats ...	3 0 0	
	Total ...	989 10 1	

N.B.—Several petty sums entered as paid to peons, &c., are not noticed.

(Signed) J. D. B. GRIBBLE,
Acting Sub-Collector.

20th June 1871.

Telegram to Mr. H. E. SULLIVAN, dated 9th August 1879.

Your confidential, dated 25th July. Necessary documents signed including principal and sons. You may act at once in anticipation of receipt of these documents already despatched. Government has also selected Berhampore for destination.

From C. G. MASTER, *Esq., Acting Chief Secretary to Government, to* H. E. SULLIVAN, *Esq., on Special Duty, dated Ootacamund, 9th August* 1879.

With reference to your confidential letter of the 25th ultimo, I am directed to confirm the telegram* sent to you this day, and to enclose an original order of Government and warrants for the arrest and detention of the Munsubdar and his son or sons, it being understood that only sons over sixteen years of age are to be arrested. Three warrants are enclosed made out in the name of ——— Bhoopaty, son of so and so, Munsubdar, &c., to enable you to have the arrests made; but it will be well that you should at once wire the names in full of the sons who may be arrested when warrants may be issued stating the names in full. You will make no insertion in the warrants now sent.

* "Your confidential, dated 25th July. Necessary documents signed including principal and sons. You may act at once in anticipation of receipt of these documents already despatched. Government has also selected Berhampore for destination."

2. The enclosed order to the Inspector-General of Police should be handed to Colonel Drever or other selected officer and the parties despatched to Berhampore by sea without delay. You should communicate with the District Magistrate of Ganjam on the subject, intimating probable date of arrival and the sum you consider sufficient to be allowed for the maintenance of the Munsubdar and his family. An order will be sent direct to Mr. Horsley as to the arrangements for the reception and custody of the State prisoners.

To

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
AND ALL POLICE OFFICERS SERVING UNDER THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Whereas it has been deemed necessary to place Rambhoopaty Davoo, Munsubdar of Rampa Taluk, Godavari District, and his sons under personal restraint at Berhampore, Ganjam District, you are hereby directed, on application from H. E. Sullivan, Esq., on special duty, disturbed districts, to arrest the said Munsubdar and his sons and convey them in safe custody to Berhampore, and place them in charge of the District Magistrate of Ganjam, together with the accompanying warrants issued under Regulation II of 1819.

(By order of the Governor in Council.)

OOTACAMUND,
9th August 1879.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Read again—

Reports of Officers on the Disturbances in Rampa received up to this date.

No. 114-A. ORDER THEREON, 9th August 1879, No. 1952.

Resolved that it is necessary the Munsubdar of Rampa Taluk, Godavari District, and his sons above the age of sixteen should be placed under restraint at a distance from the scenes of the disturbance, and that warrants under Section 2, Regulation II. of 1819, be accordingly prepared for their detention at Berhampore.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.

To the District Magistrate, Ganjam, dated Ootacamund, 9th August 1879, *No.* 1953.

I am directed by His Grace the Governor in Council to forward to you four warrants* for the detention in your custody, as State Prisoners,† of the marginally noted persons, who will be despatched for the purpose from Rajahmundry.

* Will be transmitted together with the prisoners from Rajahmundry.

† Rambhoopaty Davoo, Munsubdar of Rampa Taluk, Godavari District, and his sons.

2. You will receive and detain them as State Prisoners under Regulation II of 1819. It is not the wish of Government that they should be actually imprisoned, but you will take measures for their safe keeping in some secure house in Berhampore, under sufficient Police watch and guard, taking measures to ascertain what persons resort to them. You will not subject them to any needless rigor, but will adopt precautions against escape.

3. The periodical reports required by Section 3, Regulation II of 1819, should be furnished to Government regularly.

4. You will assign to the State Prisoners such maintenance allowance as in communication with Mr. Sullivan, on special duty in the disturbed district, you may consider suitable and sufficient.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.

To

THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, GANJAM.

Whereas the Governor in Council, for good and sufficient reasons, has seen fit to determine that Rambhoopaty Davoo, Munsubdar of Rampa Taluk, Godavari District, shall be placed under personal restraint at Berhampore, Ganjam District, you are hereby required and commanded, in pursuance of that determination, to receive the person above named into your custody and to deal with him in conformity to the orders of the Governor in Council and the provisions of Regulation II of 1819.

(By order of the Governor in Council.)

OOTACAMUND,
9th August 1879.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Read again—
G.O., dated 9th August 1879, *No.* 1952.

No. 259. ORDER THEREON, 20th August 1879, No. 2111.

Warrants having been issued under Regulation II of 1819 for placing the Munsubdar of Rampa Taluk, Godavari District, and his sons under personal restraint at Berhampore, for reasons connected with the disturbed condition of the Rampa Taluk and the oppressive exactions alleged to have been made upon the people of Rampa, His Grace the Governor in Council considers it desirable to proceed under Section 9 of the Regulation to attach the estate and lands of the said Munsubdar, and directs accordingly that the Collector of the Godavari District do assume the management thereof, and conduct the same agreeably to Section 10 of the aforesaid Regulation.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.